

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wook (US 5,894,136).

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shin (US 5,828,433).

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 is objected to for minor informalities.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants amend claims 1-3 to further define the invention, and cancel claim 4. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-28 are pending with claims 11-28 being withdrawn from consideration.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 1 is objected to for minor informalities. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that “it is not clear if the pixel electrode or the pixel region is defined by a crossing of the gate line and the data line.” Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “the pixel region being defined by a crossing of the gate line and the data line.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, clearly defines the pixel region, and respectfully request that the objection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the recitation of “a passivation layer” in claims 3 and 4 in combination with the insulating layer

of claim 2 is not specifically supported by the specification. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 2 and 3 to recite features of only “a passivation layer” and have cancelled claim 4. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3, as amended, complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn. Applicants request that the rejection of claim be withdrawn as moot.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wook (US 5,894,136), and claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shin (US 5,828,433). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recites in independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2, 3 and 5-10.

Independent claim 1 recites an array substrate for a liquid crystal display device including “a data line including a first data line having a first width and a second data line having a second width overlying the first data line, the second width is larger than the first width.” In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Wook apparently teaches a chromium data line 9 formed overlying an n-type amorphous silicon layer 8. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the n-type amorphous silicon layer 8 of Wook cannot be considered “a first data line,” as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Wook for teaching that the n-type amorphous silicon layer 8 is a data line, but is merely an ohmic contact layer.

In further contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Shin teaches an ITO electrical contact 6A that contacts an end portion of a source pad 2A. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert

that the source pad 2A of Shin cannot be considered “a first data line,” as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Shin for teaching that the source pad 2A is a data line, but merely a pad region to make electrical contact to a source line.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that both Wook and Shin fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device including “a data line including a first data line having a first width and a second data line having a second width overlying the first data line, the second width is larger than the first width,” as recited by independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2, 3 and 5-10.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3 and 5-10 are neither taught nor suggested by either of Wook or Shin. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: June 23, 2004

Customer Number: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20004

202-739-3000